



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,066	10/06/2000	Rama Ranganathan	UTSD:645US/MTG	2858

7590 03/06/2002
Mark T. Garrett
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
SUITE 2400
600 CONGRESS AVENUE
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

CLOW, LORI A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631
DATE MAILED: 03/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,066

Applicant(s)

RANGANATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on January 24, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>7</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the current application. Claims 19-34 were canceled.

Applicant should be aware that the IDS filed 01/24/02 was considered and that a copy of PTO-1449 is signed and enclosed.

Claims Objections-Informalities

Claims 2 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The methods of "executing using a machine" do not further limit the methods of claim 1 or 10, which include in the steps of the method accessing data.

Claims 7 and 16 are objected to for failing to spell out the acronym PDZ. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections-35 USC 101

U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The method for identifying positions in a polymer family, consisting of accessing data, identifying positions, and generating graphical images comprises only manipulation of data. In such a case where data are merely stored as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing process performed by the computer, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer. Such descriptive material is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter (MPEP 2106, IV, 1(b)).

Furthermore, not all processes are statutory under 35 USC 101, as put forth in *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technical arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to the skilled artisan or (B) be limited to a practical application within the technological arts.

In the instant case, the nonfunctional descriptive material may be claimed in combination with other functional descriptive multi-media material on a computer-readable medium to provide the necessary functional and structural interrelationship to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 101.

Claims Rejections-35 USC 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1631

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The method of identifying one or more positions in a polymer family requires identification of the positions in a multiple sequence alignment. However, the steps taken in order to perform step (b) are not stated and it is unclear as to how this would be accomplished.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Step (b) and (c), respectively, require calculation of statistical significance. However, significance values are not disclosed, leaving this essential step open to interpretation.

Claim Rejections-35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1631

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, and 13-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortiz et al., and further in view of LiCita et al. Ortiz et al. teach a method of prediction of protein structures using multiple sequence alignments. In this method, many sequences can be grouped into structurally conserved families, leading to improved predictions of protein structure (page 316, introduction). The accessing of data from these databases meets the limitations of claim 1(a) and claim 10(a) and (c) (page 319). These programs are executed on a computer and graphical images of the alignments are presented. The sequences in these cases are clearly polymer sequences, comprised of monomers, which are amino acids. Furthermore, in determination of structure, free energy associations between molecules are calculated (page 320).

LiCita et al. teach a method for measuring the interaction between mutation site by measuring free energies that are associated with some function of the protein (page 3134), thus

Art Unit: 1631

meeting the limitations of claim 1(b) and 10(b). In one aspect of the paper, LiCita actually teaches this calculation for human hemoglobin, as in claim 9 and 18 (page 3134-3135).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to combine the method of free-energy calculation with that of multiple sequence alignment, in order to identify structurally conserved protein families. Multiple sequence alignment is a powerful tool that has allowed the development of several techniques in order to assess protein structure based on several different variables, such as free-energy calculation. It is suggested by LiCita that more models for molecular action and protein structure and function are necessary, using computational approaches that will allow more quantitative understanding of all of the energetic interactions within a protein (page 3137-3138).

Because all claims depend from claim 1, which is rejected, all claims are rejected.

Inquiries


Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242, or (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Patent Analyst, Pauline Farrier, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3550, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


MARY K. ZEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 1631

March 5, 2002

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit 1631

Lori A. Clow